

**A REPORT ON
THE 2003 ANNAPOLIS
COLLABORATIVE PROCESS**

The Bowman Area: Phase I

**PREPARED FOR THE OFFICE OF
THE MAYOR OF ANNAPOLIS**

The Annapolis Collaborative Process is a Project of
The Office of the Mayor of Annapolis Ellen O. Moyer

**A REPORT ON 2003 ANNAPOLIS
COLLABORATIVE PROCESS
The Bowman Area: Phase I**

**Prepared by Jerome Miron
November 20, 2003**

**For the Mayor and Citizens of Annapolis
And for the Participants of the
2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process**

**Conducted at The Council Chambers
City of Annapolis
Annapolis, Maryland
November 12, 2003**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	4
Background	5
The Process Explained	6
The Diagnostic Task	7
12 Prioritized Problems	8
Transition to Recommendations	12
12 Prioritized Action Recommendations	13
Concluding Comments	17
Appendix	18

SUMMARY

This *Report* documents the results of *Phase I* of *The 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process (ACP)* conducted on November 12, 2003 at the Council Chambers of the City of Annapolis. In 2002, the Mayor of Annapolis, Ellen Moyer, sponsored the first *2002 ACP* as a unique way of organizing a meeting for citizens, business leaders, and police officials to enable them to focus on a problem statement affecting the West Street Area.

The 2003 ACP continues this process to focus on a different locale, The Bowman Area including Annapolis Gardens and adjacent locations.

The 2003 ACP included twenty-five participants who represented residents, business leaders, the City Council, religious institutions, the media, police personnel, officials from the Housing Authority of the City of Annapolis (HACA), staff from the Mayor's Office, select departments of local and county government, and the County School Board.

These individuals met for seven hours to identify, clarify, and vote on what can be done within this area for the next three months in order to implement agreed on action steps to address the wide range of problems and issues that affect this area.

This *Report* describes how the *2003 ACP* and its users accomplished its purposes. We explain the steps followed by participants and we document the problems and solutions, chosen by participants, during their work as individuals and as collaborators in different team-configurations.

We offer some concluding comments that address *Phase II* of *The 2003 ACP* scheduled to occur sometime in the early months of 2004.

A concluding *Appendix* contains a one-page description of the ACP; Mayor Moyer's invitation letter sent to participants, and the day-long schedule of tasks and steps followed by participants.

Jerome Miron
November 20, 2003

BACKGROUND

Issues affecting social, physical, economic, and safety problems affecting the Bowman Area and the decentralized housing units administered by the Housing Authority of the City of Annapolis (HACA) have been noted for several years. Recently, individual residents, business leaders, and the Annapolis Police Department documented multiple problems that affect the quality of life, wellbeing, and public safety needs of many in this area. Individual and nascent groups have been searching for ways to assure that efforts to address these issues would proceed in a manner that would benefit all and, thereby, enhance the quality of life in the Bowman Area.

Mayor Moyer and her staff decided to introduce the *Annapolis Collaborative Process* to the Bowman Area based on the success that such a process had in 2002 when the ACP was applied to problems found in the West Street Area. Consultations and meetings were held to produce a one-sentence problem statement that could capture the overarching dimensions of problems affecting the Bowman Area based on statements derived from many complainants or observers.

The agreed to Bowman Area problem statement is:

There is concern that citizens, police, and businesses in the Bowman Area do not communicate with each other about problems or issues that affect their safety, their well being, and their communities in a manner that contributes to the mutual benefit of all

The Mayor's staff identified participants who would be representative of different *stakeholders* from the Bowman Area all of whom were familiar with the area and its problems.

Individualized letters were sent to each prospective participant. The problem statement was summarized in the letter and participants were asked to attend a full-day meeting to work on this problem statement using *The 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process*. A one-page description of the process was attached to the invitation.

A 17-page *Participant Handbook* was produced to describe how these participants were to work as individuals and as team members. Follow-up phone calls were made to participants as reminders and to encourage their participation in the *2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process*.

On November 12, 2003, 25 participants were present at 9:30 AM in the City Council Chambers; they remained and worked throughout the day until 3:45 PM. This *Report* documents their findings and recommendations.

THE ANNAPOLIS COLLABORATIVE PROCESS APPLIED TO THE BOWMAN AREA PROBLEM STATEMENT

Purposes

Meetings of whatever type are not always productive. Participants often feel that their time spent in meetings are not always well spent. These observations are compounded when persons are invited to public meetings that require them to interact with those with whom they are unfamiliar.

The Annapolis Collaborative Process (ACP) is a way of organizing a meeting to balance and increase individual participation, to enhance productivity, and to reduce errors in compiling individual judgments into group decisions. The ACP is a variation of a process crafted at the Wharton School as a technique to be used to develop action plans. A major difference between the Wharton model and the ACP is that the latter requires participants to work within a disciplined process, in step wise fashion, that is extremely time bound. The Wharton model usually extends each step over a longer period of time—sometimes months. The ACP is sometimes described as a strategic planning process applied to complex problems faced by individuals, organizations, and governments.

The process aims at completing two different *group* tasks: (1) to identify and diagnose a complex problem, and (2) to agree on actions to be taken as a consequence of the diagnosis. The group or team tasks and steps associated with the diagnosis of the Bowman Area problem were done in the morning session from 9:45 am – 12:15 pm. The group or team tasks and steps associated with solutions to problems were done from 1:00 pm – 3:45 pm.

A Note about Steps for Tasks

The *2003 ACP Participant Handbook* contains instructions that describe six steps to be followed by individual members assigned to the morning and afternoon teams. The *Appendix* displays the schedule that highlights each step. Recorders who were not participants were assigned to each team to display the results of each step on charts.

- n* to generate individual ideas in writing;
- n* to record on charts all individual ideas for team members to see;
- n* to review and discuss all ideas in order to clarify or consolidate, but not evaluate, each displayed idea;
- n* to choose only four ideas by a *preliminary* vote using a weighted numerical scale which were then tallied and ranked;
- n* to review, discuss, clarify, debate, consolidate, re-order these four choices and/or lobby for other lower ranked ideas;
- n* to choose and to display the team's *final voted agreements* on four statements that were ranked from Priority 1 to Priority 4

DIAGNOSTIC TASK: MIXED STAKEHOLDER TEAMS COLLABORATE IN THE MORNING SESSION

The diagnostic task was done during the morning sessions by *mixed stakeholder* teams. Each team was composed of a mix of police, business and religious leaders, Council and governmental representatives, and resident-citizens of the Bowman Area. Thereby, the interaction between and among individuals in these mixed teams seeks to provide a more detailed and broader understanding of the problems from differing perspectives. Yet, these perspectives were subjected to detailed clarifications by individuals, discussions about the meaning of ideas, consolidation of similar ideas, and voting, twice, on the priority to be given to selected and agreed upon statements.

Three mixed stakeholder teams, usually averaging six to seven participants, worked as individuals and as collaborators on the diagnostic task and its associated steps. Their objective was to identify and prioritize those factors that contribute to the problem statement about the Bowman Area. Each of the three teams followed the step by step, time-bound, instructions provided in the *2003 ACP Handbook*.

The results of this diagnostic task were a list of four prioritized factors provided by each of the three-mixed stakeholder teams—a total of 12 such factors. These factors were displayed on charts for all to review during the luncheon break between 12:15 pm and 1:00 pm.

During this review, as participants examined these problems, they were instructed to think about what they would choose as solutions or recommendations for solutions during the afternoon session.

We list these prioritized problem statements in the next section of this *Report*. Despite the wide differences and perspectives represented within each *mixed stakeholder* groups, the careful reader of this part of the *Report* will recognize similarities in the descriptions and ranking of problems.

12 PRIORITY PROBLEMS IN THE BOWMAN AREA

This *Report* clusters these priority problems not by individual teams, but by all three-mixed stakeholder teams. We have taken the final, rank ordered and voted priorities, provided by each of the three teams. There were three teams that produced four prioritized and agreed upon descriptions of the major problems affecting the Bowman Area that ranged from the highest priority vote (1) to the lowest (4). Thus, there are 12 diagnosed and priority statements to be addressed. These 12 priority statements include the nuances and clarifications used by the three teams to clarify the intent behind and within the statements. Usually, the very first sentence of each priority statement summarizes and highlights the statement itself. The statement is then clarified in each paragraph by recording data taken from the dozens of charts displayed by each team in its morning deliberations.

PRIORITY RANKINGS: PROBLEM STATEMENTS

[In reviewing these statements, the reader should preface each statement with “The problem is that...”]

Priority Problem #1

q *There is a need to improve and enhance the education of children, teens, and adults in schools and in families.* Linked to such enhancements in education across the board, there is also a need to expand and insure job training for the unemployed or underemployed so that access to and employment by public and private sector establishments can be increased for residents. Among the specific items cited were education and training for school drop-outs (16 years and above), tutoring, mentoring, GED courses, skills training, resume and interview training, and, information about transportation to off-area sites for such training and education. Many educational issues can be addressed by better communication between HACA officials, city and county agencies, and within residential settings through the use of brochures, fliers, and other media. Attention by the police to potential safety issues both in the area and at the Recreation/Community Center, where useful education or training could occur, would be enhanced by periodic visits of foot or unit patrols that are encouraged to stop and visit the Center.

q *Residents need to become positive stakeholders about the use of their properties and acquire a stronger positive sense of ownership, pride, and responsibility for their residence, their surroundings, and their community.* Residents are not calling police when they observe or hear about drug activities—whether using or selling. Conversely, some residents complain that police are not responsive to such calls. Nonetheless, there were several comments about the silence of residents who may know or see illegal activities. Such silence destroys the trust that should exist between residents and law enforcement and encourages a false sense of “us” versus “them” . Such a false sense often translates into “a mentality of black versus black or black versus white” that

benefits no one except users and sellers many of whom are not residents and most of whom see residents only as potential consumers.

q Residents agree that drug use and particularly drug sales are leading to drug addictions in greater and greater numbers. It is an intolerable problem that can only be addressed by residents working together with other residents *and* with police and other agencies of government. Of special note was the need to learn from the police about how to contact them without fear of being identified as sources. Residents are keenly aware of what has happened in other jurisdictions when residents contacted the police about drug sales and use as happened in the killing of the Dawson family in Baltimore. Residents need assurances about confidential contacts that protect identities and safeguard residents when they call the police. Police must be able to establish a confidential way of being contacted in a manner that overcomes the fears and concerns of residents.

Priority Problems #2

q Police presence and police visibility on the streets adjacent to and within the HACA units must be increased. Residents and business leaders alike noted the presence of non-residents involved in drug sales and use and the consequent need for residents to communicate and consult with the police on such matters. Open-air drug sales, illegal solicitation, and the use of drugs occur frequently within the Bowman Area and its housing units. Such activity is largely but not always associated with non-residents. Access to and communication with law enforcement officers is made easier and safer through on-street contacts with such officers. The police should reconsider the use of a police-substation, staffed at appropriate times by police representatives, civilian or sworn officers, who can, by their presence, receive or consult with residents.

q The need for greater and more frequent communications between and among residents is paramount even if such communications are issues concerning bad-news about events and practices that are occurring within Bowman Area residents. Small organized groups of residents should be formed to communicate with businesses and the police on issues that affect the entire Bowman Area. Members of one such group were participants in the 2003 ACP. Such groups could also lobby for appropriate changes within the Bowman Area by their contacts with such agencies as the HACA, Council, and city and county agencies. Waiting for others to act on their behalf is no substitute for actions proposed by residents themselves to present to others.

q The use of a "Code of Silence" by some residents influences other residents and results in a loss of information about illegal activities that frustrate police efforts to prevent and control crime, particularly drug-related crimes that are not witnessed by the police but are known to others. There are residents who aid and abet drug use and sales. Residents know about those who sell crack pipes and drug paraphernalia.

Residents know about those who violate lease agreements by allowing others to stay with them and/or rent rooms to drug dealers. Some residents receive money to remain silent. This

Code of Silence must cease. The police and other agencies wish to work with residents to create safe and secure methods of notifications to alert the police to illegal activities. Residents are asked to be responsive to police wishes so that all can work to ensure that progress be made in creating a secure and safe homeland for all residents.

Priority #3

q There is a wide-ranging agreement among residents, businesses, and police personnel about the need and necessity for a variety of programs that are presently either deficient or non-existent in the Bowman Area. The lack of organized and supervised recreation for youth and young adults and the inconsistent or absent use of such programming in the Recreation/Community Center were frequently cited. Health services and health education concerns are also needs that could be met by public health agencies that should make an effort to access and use this facility for their services. Health and treatment programs for drug and alcohol abuse such as Narcotics Anonymous or other similar groups should be publicized and made available to substance abusers in the area. Another need cited frequently was that the Boys and Girls Club contract for services is not being actively implemented for the Annapolis Gardens and Bowman Court children. Many residents in the HACA decentralized units urged the need for affordable day care particularly for residents who either work, are in training, or seek ways to obtain more education. To this end, the use of the Recreation/Community Center could provide space for such supervised and accredited day care programming at select times and days.

q There is a lack of adult involvement in a variety of settings associated with the Bowman Area. Adults are usually absent in programs that address chronic issues associated with school activities both within schools and after school. Adults are encouraged to support their own and other children's education by regular contact with teachers and administrators as well as participation in parent-teacher meetings or briefings. The Bowman Area and the Annapolis Gardens' communities (including businesses and non-profits) are usually led by adults who need to commit to an ongoing series of dialogues to foster and encourage ways to address educational and social issues affecting not just resident but others in these locales.

q There are residents who knowingly violate their lease agreements in several way: allowing homeless men and women to occupy, at a cost, their units; renting rooms to drug dealers; obtaining money from dealers to keep quiet about illegal activities. The HACA, the police, and residents need to collaborate on ways to address these problems together in ways that contribute to the benefit of all.

Priority #4

q To date, the HACA has failed to provide on-site property managers for different housing areas. Such types of decentralized managers would be a focal point for residents and others to address many of the problems cited by participants. Many participants recognize the fact that the HACA is undergoing change. They also recognize that there

are fiscal problems that require some trade-off between hiring of new personnel and the need for re-organization compared with costs associated with property maintenance and the mitigation of lead paint problems. However, it may be possible to develop some form of compromise that can address such problems. Residents, Council, police officials, religious institutions, and business representatives stand ready to assist the leadership of the HACA in searching for creative ways to sort out and begin to examine ways to address these issues. Such assistance can provide a useful context for the HACA so that it is not seen as having to carry this burden alone.

q Residents are concerned about the lack of job opportunities. Job fairs coupled with education about how to prepare for, seek out, and obtain jobs could be a first step that, at least, would encourage residents. A jointly-sponsored job outreach program or project conducted by both public and private entities could be held within the Bowman Area, at the Recreation/Community Center. Residents stand ready to assist.

q Within the surrounding area and within the HACA units there is a need for upgrading and maintaining the investments already made in sustaining the infrastructure of the area. Cited were improvements in lighting along Admiral Drive, Bowman Drive, and Croll Drive; beautification and upgrades need to be addressed including cutting grass in the common areas, litter pick-ups, and beautification in general. In addition, the Recreation/Community Center needs upkeep such as roofing repairs, painting, and lighting improvements. Part of such infrastructure improvements should also be directed at creating and maintaining a safe environment through the presence or quick access to site property managers—an issue that the HACA continues to address and should, one hopes, be resolved in the near future.

The next section of this *Report* describes how participants were assigned to common stakeholder teams and how they acted to identify and agree on ways to prioritize solutions to these problem statements.

TRANSITION TO THE AFTERNOON SESSION

These 12 rank-ordered, prioritized, problem statements became the singular database used by 2003 ACP participants during the afternoon session. The task for the afternoon was to identify and rank order solutions or recommendations for these problems. In the next section of this *Report* we describe how the *mixed stakeholder teams* were re-assigned to form three separate and distinct *common stakeholder teams*.

The afternoon solution or action tasks were done by *common stakeholder* teams—so called in that each of these three teams were composed only of residents, or only of business and other leaders, or only of police officials. Members of these teams had already collaborated with others in the morning diagnostic and problem choice sessions. Thus, some of them had a clear sense of what some of the details of the problem statements meant.

Teams reviewed instructions in the *ACP Handbook* for this afternoon session. The steps to be followed were the same steps they followed in the morning session that are summarized in the 2003 ACP schedule found in the *Appendix*. Their familiarity with these steps enhanced their productivity in a time frame that lasted from 1:00 pm to 3:45 pm.

However, there were two major instructions they were to follow as they proceeded to identify and agree on actions or solutions addressed to the 12 problem statements. As they followed the six steps, all three teams were advised that their team discussions and votes were to be guided as follows:

n Each team was to link their action/solution to the resources that each team possesses or could implement. Resources were carefully defined as that which they have as an organization, that which they can access through their networks, and that which they have as influence over others. All of these resources were to be used to address the diagnosed and prioritized problems. They were not to focus on funding.

n Each common stakeholder team was to select their actions/solutions to be planned on paper or implemented within the next 90 days. At the end of this period, sometime in the early part of 2004, all of the 2003 ACP participants will be invited by Mayor Moyer to meet again. They will participate in *Phase II* of *The 2003 ACP* to review and identify what actions/solutions *actually* have been done by them or others—what was done, what was not done, and why.

Following this guidance and completing the step by step process, each of the three *common stakeholder teams* were to agree on a final list of four identified, discussed, and prioritized actions or solutions that they will activate to address the 12 prioritized problems. Thus, these action steps became the solutions they chose as the outcome of the full day experience with *The 2003 ACP*

12 PRIORTIZED ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS

It has often been said that a well-diagnosed problem contains the seeds of solutions. This is true of many if not most of the 12 Prioritized Action Recommendations agreed to by the three common stakeholder teams. The reader will note that these recommendations include many of the ideas written by mixed stakeholder teams listed earlier. In effect, all of the common stakeholder team recommendations are based on and derived from earlier statements. Thus, the brief action recommendations are to read within the context of the earlier problem statements. These action recommendations are not merely summary actions; the common stakeholder team members know what needs to be done. We include the names of individual stakeholder team members who will coordinate, collaborate, or assist in the implementation of their respective action recommendations.

Law Enforcement Action Recommendations

q The Annapolis Police Department (APD) will design, deliver, and follow up on workshops for residents and others in the Bowman Area at least one per month during the next 90 days. These workshops will present information, advice and procedures to be followed in the following three topics:

- (1) crime prevention theory and practices associated with home security and the use of various ways to address the prevention of crimes through changes in the environment where crimes are likely to occur;
- (2) police services associated with crime reporting, and requesting and accessing police and investigative services with special emphasis on issues associated with suspicious actions, probable cause, and witness information, and,
- (3) juvenile crime occurrences and how residents and the police can act together to prevent, lessen and respond to such occurrences.

q Within 90 days, the APD will establish more frequent patrols within the Bowman and Annapolis Gardens areas and other similar HCAC units. Officers will also be told to begin more community contacts within these areas especially within the adjacent areas around the Recreation/Community Center and other locations within the Bowman and Annapolis Gardens area.

q The APD will expand outreach and training for residents in the Bowman area on recruitment, leadership, and participation in Neighborhood Watch programming and practices *and* outreach, recruitment, and training for groups of residents on how to create and maintain community-based resident patrols.

q Within 90 days, the APD will conduct numerous educational programs for residents and others in the Bowman Area on drug use and sales to include, at a minimum, lessons learned about types of illegal drugs.

Residents will also learn how to recognize the signs of drug use and sales, drug paraphernalia, and issues and procedures to be

followed in identifying drug sellers and dealers, buyers. Additional information will be given about drug locations and sites, drug runners and enforcers and other such information about procedures to be followed for reporting and safety.

[Team members: Robert Beans, C. Redondo, Hal Dalton, Norman Crews, Nathaniel Smith]

Business, Council, and Religious Leaders Action Recommendations

This group described its recommendations and assigned individuals to oversee, coordinate, and implement its set of recommendations. Individual names are assigned to each specific sub-set of its recommendations.

q Actions to be taken in response to adult education and job training problems will include:

(1) Seek authority to transport to off-site locations, by public or private means, those residents who sign up for education and job training. [Craig Coats and Clyde Caldwell]

(2) Develop, coordinate, and conduct adult education and job training [Jim Turner]

(3) Post recruitment fliers door to door and at resident meetings [Clyde Caldwell and resident volunteers]

q Actions to be taken in response to issues associated with the absence of programs at the Recreation/Community Center and the need for improvements and repairs for the Center: Multiple actions with coordinators listed include:

--clean up and repairs by HACA [Classie Hoyle];

--contact resident council [Craig Coats];

--contact Head Start about use of their space for day care services [Kim Blouin];

--contact Stanton Center staff for ideas about how to conduct outreach and establish programs similar to that done by Stanton for the Clay Street area [Kim Blouin];

--design and conduct an empowerment meeting for residents to expand their skills [Jim Turner and Craig Coats];

--introduce Narcotics Anonymous meetings and other substance abuse programs to the Bowman Area [Craig Coats].

q Actions to be taken in response to issues associated with HACA on-site ideas have already begun and will continue to be taken by Jim Turner and Clyde Caldwell.

q Actions to be taken in response to security issues identified by residents: Classie Hoyle will consult with HACA officials and Police Chief Johnson regarding the use of parking identification markers or stickers for residents and the installation of surveillance cameras similar to those installed along the Clay Street corridor.

[Team Members: George Nassif, James Turner, Tony Spencer, Classie Hoyle, Clyde Caldwell, Johnny Calhoun, Craig Coats]

Resident Action Recommendations

There were several individuals who were directly associated with the development of the Resident Action Recommendations. Some of these individuals already are members of a resident group whose objective is to reduce and prevent crime. They will coordinate among themselves to accomplish their recommendations within the next three months. Other individuals represent the business community and the HACA.

q Consult with HACA officials and other City or County agencies as needed to reduce the number of entry and exit points leading into and away from housing units. During these consultations discuss with HACA officials how to obtain and disseminate to the appropriate officials information about living arrangements by some residents that may be in violation of lease agreements.

q Consult with the APD and other City or County agencies as needed to plan for and implement video and/or camera surveillance systems at different locations within and adjacent to the Bowman and Annapolis Gardens areas. During these consultations, discuss with the APD information about suspicious activities linked to “the Goody Bus” and other resident suspicions associated with drug sales and use. Residents will also collaborate with the APD to learn how to encourage more residents to provide information to the police about drug use and sales, in a safe and secure manner.

q In collaboration with the APD residents will coordinate and conduct a joint-resident-police Neighborhood Watch meeting in conjunction with the well-attended Christmas Program on December 13 at the Recreation/Community Center.

q Funds now spent on the Boys and Girls Club contract should be replaced and re-programmed into other sponsored programs such as day care, adult education, job training or other equally suitable programs as listed in several of the 12 Priority Problem statements listed earlier

[Team Members: Carolyn Butler, Wanda Tydings, Margaret Snowden, Patricia Holliday, Malinda Wilson, Tamara Brown]

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Stakeholders from the Bowman Area met, diagnosed, and presented action items to resolve identified problems in this Area. The 12 Priority Action Recommendations items may be called a tri-partite contract entered into by three stakeholder groups, residents, business and religious leaders, and police officials.

This contract is in play and in place until sometime in February or March 2004. At that time, these same stakeholders will be invited back by Mayor Moyer to review and discuss what has been done, what has not been done, and why, regarding the implementation of each of the 12 Priority Action Recommendations in this contract. Only then will their work be able to be evaluated.

APPENDIX

MAYOR ELLEN MOYER'S INVITATION LETTER

You and I share concerns about the current and future progress of the Bowman Area. Our priority is to identify and resolve problems and issues expressed by residents, police, and businesses in this area that affect their safety, their well-being, and their communities in a manner that contributes to the mutual benefit of all.

To that end, I am inviting you to participate in *The 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process* (ACP) to bring together Bowman Area representatives from police, citizens, and businesses in a one-day event on Wednesday, November 12, 2003 beginning at 9:30 AM and ending at 3:45 PM. You will be my guest for lunch. The event will be held at the City Council Chambers.

Last year, the first ACP was conducted in the West Street Area. Participants produced several beneficial short and long-term effects for its citizens, businesses, and the police. I am selecting you to participate and be embedded in the *2003 ACP* as we continue our on-going efforts to make our city more viable and livable for all.

I am attaching a fact-sheet that will clarify the details of *The 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process*. I look forward to seeing you on November 12. Should you have any questions, please contact Mike Miron at The Office of Economic Development, 160 Duke of Gloucester Street, Annapolis, MD 21401 Phone: 410-263-8940.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mayor

Attachment: *The 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process*

THE 2003 ANNAPOLIS COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

Bowman Area Problem Statement

There is concern that citizens, law enforcement, and business leaders in the Bowman Area do not work with each other to identify and resolve problems or issues that affect their safety, their well-being, and their communities, in a manner that contributes to the mutual benefit of all.

Morning Task: Three teams will identify factors that contribute to the problem

Participants will be grouped into teams (each team will be made up of police, citizens, and business representatives) plus one recorder for each team. Recorders will be selected from those who participated in the 2002 Annapolis Collaborative Process.

Each team member will use a *Handbook* to produce an agreed-upon prioritized list of *four* factors that contribute to the problem cited above. Charts prepared by team recorders will display, at a minimum, these fifteen factors.

Afternoon Task: Stakeholder teams will select those factors that each can address to better the Bowman area. Each team will produce a list of actions that they can put in place to resolve factors that contribute to problems.

These teams will be formed into *stakeholder* teams (teams of police only, teams of citizens only, and teams of business representatives) plus recorders.

Each team will analyze the factors listed on the charts derived from the Morning Task. Teams will follow instructions in a *Handbook* to produce a list of actions *linked* to these factors. The actions chosen by each team are to be done *within the next 90 days*. New charts listing actions will be summarized and displayed by recorders. The facilitator will gather the data from the morning and afternoon tasks, summarize the day's activities and describe the next steps to be done. A *Preliminary Report* will be sent to all participants and others to explain the process, list the factors associated with the problem, and identify stakeholder actions.

The ACP Phase II: Within 90 Days

Toward the end of the 90 day period, the same participants will be invited to a one-half day, follow-up, workshop to identify what actions have *actually* been taken by each stakeholder team—what was done, what was not done, and why. Following instructions in another *Handbook*, stakeholder teams will write recommendations to be done *by them* and *by others* to address and resolve the problem(s) of the Bowman area. A *Final Report* listing these recommendations will be distributed to participants, government officials, and those associated with the Bowman Area.

Benefits for the Bowman Area and Annapolis

The process will result in three outcomes: (1) diagnosed-action reports developed by those closest to the problem; (2) a knowledgeable and trained cadre from the Bowman area;

(3) an experienced pool of practitioners who can encourage others to accomplish the recommendations published in the *Final Report* of the 2003 Annapolis Collaborative Process.

Jerome Miron n 301.294.0517 n jpmiron@earthlink.net